1: Burrows--130 (1947-48) Woleaians
116, 475, 626 Ifalik

"Government on Ifalik, as described in this chapter, is limited to administration of certain rules regulating conduct. Another activity which might well be allotted to government is public works. But since the services performed are economic, and some of them involve distinctive techniques, it has been convenient to describe this activity under economics and technology, except for the matter of enforcing participation in communal undertakings, which will be discussed in this chapter. Various other activities performed in our culture by governmental agencies are either absent in Ifalik or seem to be outside the sphere of government as here understood.

Not all rules are regarded as governmental. Following Malinowski*, the distinction drawn here is based on the sanctions by which they are enforced. Rules not taken seriously enough to be sanctioned at all, or sanctioned only in informal ways, as by the inertia of custom, the negative sanctions of gossip and ridicule, or the positive sanction of practical efficacy, are not the concern of government. And sanctions that we regard as supernatural, whether thought of as automatic, or as administered by superhuman beings, are allotted to religion."

"* Malinowski's views on government were first formulated in 'Crime and Custom in Savage Society,' redefined later in the preface to Hogbin, 'Law and Order in Polynesia.'"

1: Burrows--144-146 (1947-48) Woleaians 43
116, 626, 646 Ifalik

"To show which rules of conduct are particularly emphasized, recurrent [145] commandments in the speeches at the three meetings are listed below, beginning with those that seemed most frequent. The list is minimal, because Tom was not so well trained for running translations as the interpreters who perform the same service at meetings of the United Nations; so his accounts were sketchy. It was only at the last meeting that I could understand any considerable part of what was going on; and even that was only midway in our stay on the island, so the language was still only dawning on me. The commandments recorded were these:

Heed the words of the chiefs
Clean away rubbish
Work hard, so that there will be plenty of food
Do not steal (with emphasis on food)
Share with the poor and sick (emphasis on food)
Build 'overwater heads' or latrines

Another commandment, not recorded at these meetings, but heard several times--one of them, in a hypothetical chief's address to the people dictated by Tom as a text--was 'Do not speak evil of people of another clan.' During one of the meetings, Paliuilimar spoke especially to people of his clan, Mangaulevār, and Maroligar followed with a brief talk which contained repeated mention of his clan, SauvelārIk. I did not manage to get a translation of this passage.

The repeated insistence on respect and obedience to the chiefs illustrates one of the main purposes of these meetings. The repeated emphasis on food suggests that one of the main sentiments clusters about food; at least, that abundance of food is a master value. The repeated strictures against idling and stealing suggest that these may be particularly common forms of misbehavior, though the only specific instance noted was the tongue-lashing about shirking communal fishing, which seemed to be directed at one or more specific malingerers.

Conspicuous by their absence from these harangues are rules about sexual relations and violence. To be sure, the one mention of the traditional behavior required of menstruating women is in the general area of sexuality. But nothing was said about clan exogamy or adultery. Clan exogamy is certainly taken seriously. We have seen that there were no violations of it in 1947-8. Perhaps it is so generally observed there is no need to talk about it.

Adultery is quite another matter. According to common report it was, at least, not uncommon. The fact that the chiefs did not condemn it in their speeches may indicate that this is a rule which the government does not try to enforce.

As to violence, that seems to be, like violation of clan exogamy, so rare that it does not have to be condemned verbally. Certainly the courteous, peaceable behavior of these people is one of their most striking characteristics.

The frequent exhortations against theft in the chiefs speeches at public meetings

suggest that this crime may not be uncommon. There is no question that public opinion strongly condemns it. Tom repeatedly expressed abhorrence of a thief (melmorók). But he as often assured us that the people of Ifalik would not steal anything of ours; that we need have no hesitation about leaving our property unguarded. Judging by the chiefs' exhortations, the kind of property most often stolen is food. At least once, taro was specifically mentioned. In the taro patches the vegetation is so dense, and the place so little frequented, that a worker could often take taro from someone else's patch without being seen. All we can say, in the absence of specific cases, is that theft, whether rare or not, is at least rarely detected."

28: Spiro--23 (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
226, 626 Ifalik

"When Taroman was finished, Wolptau took over. He told the men that should any of them go fishing they were to bring their catch to the chiefs for distribution so that the old and the sick would be provided for. This is the customary procedure, but Wolptau saw fit to remind the men of it, since some of the men had been violating this custom. This demonstrates how violations of custom are handled. No individual is rebuked, or singled out, but a general rule of conduct is enunciated, which apparently is sufficient to ensure conformity."

28: Spiro--81 [3] (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
116, 626, 848, 581 Ifalik

"Aside from the offspring of incestuous unions, there is no native concept of illegitimacy. The children of unmarried sweethearts (gamar) are evaluated no differently from those of married couples. The natives point out that they desire babies, that they love them, that they are necessary to replenish the population, and what difference, therefore, does it make whether they are born to married couples or to sweethearts. Thus the native name for an infant, sauwau for a girl, ligau for a boy, is the same whether its parents be married or unmarried.

It is expected, however, that a man will marry his sweetheart should she become pregnant. This is not compulsory, but should he refuse he would be scorned and called a 'very bad man' by all the people."

28: Spiro--110-111
116, 577, 867, 626

(1949-48) 1949

Woleaians-1-3
Ifalik

"As in all cultures, Ifaluk too inculcates its values in its children, and it does a very good job, since the behaviors not sanctioned by the culture all of which are found in the children, are extinguished in the adults. [sic] In order to have as complete and valid information as possible on the socialization process--both the kinds of behavior sanctioned and not sanctioned and the techniques used, both rewards and punishments. I used three checks. I employed adult informants to tell me what is done, I interviewed all the children, and I recorded my own observations. The second technique lent itself to statistical recording, which I shall produce here. The amazing thing (to me) was the identical results obtained by the three methods. All three techniques show that the non-sanctioned behaviors are: theft, disobedience, aggression (including stone throwing at people, fighting, and aggression against parents), standing and talking in the presence of adults. There is one contribution each by the adults and children that the other did not make. The adults said that children are told that they should not be lazy, but should acquire economic skill, lest they have no food. But this is a general admonition for the future, not a child's possible dereliction for which he is punished. The children added a misdemeanor for which they are punished that the adults did not mention--playing away from home, and not returning to eat.

28: Spiro--110-111 (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians-2
116, 577, 867, 626 Ifalik

Table 1

Total Number of Children From About 3 to 25

Total subjects: 42 Male: 25 Female: 17

Misdeed	No. of subjects	% of subjects	Male %	Female %
Fighting	21	50	56	41
Disobedience	18	43	40	47
Stone Throwing	11	26	36	12
Theft	10	23	32	11
Standing and talking in the presence of of adults (in canoe house)	10	23	40	0
Playing without returning home to eat.	7	16	16	23
Physical aggression against parents	3	17	0	17
Miscellaneous	14	33	28	41

Table one is the record of the misdeeds for which the children said they were punished. The figures speak for themselves, and no comment is necessary except to point out

practically all punishable behavior fall in the category of aggression.

Some of the sex differences may be commented upon, however. It will be seen that boys do more stealing and stone throwing than the girls, for reasons difficult to answer. The greater incidence of stealing among boys may be accounted for by the fact that most stolen objects are stolen from the canoe houses, and only the boys have completely free access to canoe houses. That girls do not violate the injunction against standing and talking in the presence of men can be accounted for on the same grounds. The category in which there are no male offenders is probably a result of the greater economic responsibility thrust on the young girl, which she resents, and for which she vents her aggressions. The fact that it is the mother, rather than the father, that is the brunt of the aggression is a further indication of this fact, since it is the mother that has the girl work at home.

Before we examine the techniques of enforcing these values, I may say that they are admirably successful. Though fighting occurs frequently among the children, I have seen children above the ages of ten fighting, and this pattern extends into adult life [sic] The same holds true of the other non-sanctioned behavior listed above. Of [111] course, some children learn to inhibit these culturally defined anti-social impulses before others. But it may be stated dogmatically that no child, after the age of ten, is guilty of any of them. And, what is of even greater importance, no adult is ever guilty of commiting them."

28: Spiro--111-112
116, 153, 861, 626

(1947-48).1949

Woleaians-1-4
Ifalik

"Social scientists have recently stressed the fact that imitation alone does not explain social and cultural learning, that such learning involves a system of rewards and punishments, the former serving to reinforce positive responses, and the latter serving to extinguish the wrong responses. On Ifaluk the punishments are quite definite and tangible, whereas the rewards are diffuse and mostly psychological in nature. In other words, rewards are seldom in the nature of 'Presents.' The simple cultural fact is that there is little possibility for the concept of 'present.' In a culture in which each family is an economic unit, almost entirely self-sufficient, each such family manufactures what every other family has so that there is no division of labor which results in exchange of goods. The child, therefore, cannot be offered something which the family does not already possess, and what it does possess are his for use anyway. Presents in the form of material goods would merely be an addition of something the child already has--some extra food, a larger basket, a new loin cloth--important, but not important enough so as to act as a dynamic agent in the learning process.

This leaves two other rewarding factors operating--praise and privilege. Privilege, too, is an unimportant factor, for again, given the cultural and geographical facts--the reality situation--there is little in the way of special privilege that the child can receive for good behavior. Any cultural goods the society has to offer are received automatically by the child as he matures. Such privileges as being able to listen to the

radio, to see the movie, to go for an automobile ride, etc. do not exist. Others, such as being able to stay up late at night, to go with his parents to a party or to the home of a relative are not special privileges. They are his as of right. No Ifaluk parent ever bribes his child, therefore, with the promise, that if you do such-and-such, I will permit you to do so-and-so. The pattern of reward and/or privilege following a meritorious deed is therefore, absent from this culture.

The only category remaining under reward is praise, and this is employed. The child who conforms to the social expectations, or who does something particularly meritorious, or who acquires a skill, is praised not only by his parents, but by all adults. The positive dynamics in learning, therefore, is the desire to be praised, the desire for the euphoria that accompanies the feeling of being accepted, the emotional security that comes from having pleased one's elders and merited their praise.

But this, apparently is not enough. There are negative sanctions that are even more important than the positive, though, to be sure, they may be viewed as the obverse side of the motivational coin. If one desires praise and security, one avoids blame, rejection, and ridicule. Ridicule and its resultant feeling of shame is probably the strongest factor operative in the Ifaluk learning pattern. There are, as we shall soon see, six specific punishments with which children are inflicted--almost all of which elicit shame and rejection responses rather than physical pain. Positively, then, it is the knowledge of being loved for doing the right thing--emotional security--that motivated good

behavior. Negatively, it is the feeling of being rejected, of not being loved--emotional insecurity--that soon eliminates bad behavior. 'If you do that', or 'if you no savvy that, you all same dog or pig' is the kind of ridicule that both shames the child and makes him aware of his implicity rejection by his parents. But this is not enough. There are six negative sanctions that are employed to punish the recalcitrant child, all of which, according to the children's confession, are distasteful, and should be avoided. These are being beaten,[112] spat upon, thrown in the lagoon, confined to the house, threatened with an alus, and scolded.

The child is beaten with a coconut-leaf, never with the naked hand. The actual physical pain involved, as I can testify, is slight. Being spat upon, of course, involves no physical pain at all. Being thrown into the ocean is not physically painful, though it might induce fear--fear of octopus or shark or an alus of the sea. There is no fear of drowning, since he is thrown in shallow water. Being scolded involves no physical pain, nor does being threatened with an alus, though the latter does elicit fear, for the alus, it will be remembered, causes illness. Confinement involves no physical pain, but is extremely frustrating. The children have complete mobility within their district, and being shut-in works a greater handicap on them than it would for an American child. It is the psychological experiencing of the punishment, as rejection, shame, frustration,

that is the dynamic force behind the punishments.

The following table is a statistical tabulation of the punishments reported by the children, giving the number of children who named any one punishment. Some named many, some none.

Table II

Number of subjects: 42
Male : 25
Female : 17

Punishment	No. of subj.	% of subj.	% of M.	% of F.
Beating	35	83	88	76
Spitting	22	52	56	47
Thrown in ocean	18	43	56	23
Confinement	18	43	44	41
Threatened with Alus	17	40	56	18
Scolding	14	33	24	47"

28: Spiro--112-113 (1947-48) 1949 Woleaians
116, 861, 626 Ifalik

"The next table expresses statistically, the severity of the punishment, as experienced by the child. That is, I asked each child which punishment he disliked the most. The number of children included in this table is not the entire child population, as are the first two. Some children said that none were experienced as severe. Others said that all were equally severe. And some I neglected to ask.

Table III

Number of subjects: 24
Male : 17
Female : 7

Punishment	No. of subjects	% of subjects	M%	F%
Beating	10	41	41	43
Confinement	5	20	23	14
Spitting	4	17	6	41
Ocean	3	12	17	0
Alus	2	8	11	0
Scolding	0	0	0	0

[113] The small number of female subjects permits no interpretive results to be drawn from the differential sexual responses."